



Memorandum

August 5, 1999

TO :

FROM : Ross W. Gorte
Natural Resource Economist and Policy Specialist
Resources, Science, and Industry Division

SUBJECT : The "County Schools and Services Funding Revitalization Act of 1999"

As we discussed, this memorandum addresses three particular issues raised by the draft bill, "County Schools and Services Funding Revitalization Act of 1999." The first issue is lands not covered by the payment programs identified in the definitions, §3 of the draft bill. The second is the estimated additional resources needed to achieve the "full payment amount" as provided in §3(f) of the draft.¹ The third issue is the possible and likely sources of the additional payments as provided under §4(d) of the draft. If you wish to discuss these comments or have additional questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 7-7266.

Background

Under the Act of May 23, 1908, the Forest Service has returned 25% of its receipts from the sale, lease, or other use of the national forests to the states for use on roads and schools in the counties where the national forests are located. This 25% receipt-sharing was enacted to compensate counties for the tax-exempt status of the national forests. The program is called Payments to States, because the states allocate the funds to road and school programs, but the Forest Service determines the payment to each county based on the national forest area in each county. Congress has also required 50% receipt-sharing payments to the Oregon counties which contain the revested Oregon and California (O&C) grant lands administered by the BLM. Concerns over the decline in timber sale receipts, and thus in receipt-sharing payments, have led the Administration and others to examine alternative funding arrangements to return the payments to higher levels. For a discussion of existing programs, current

¹ Estimating the cost of legislation is a task normally performed by the Congressional Budget Office, rather than by CRS. However, because of congressionally mandated priorities, CBO is not always able to provide estimates upon request, especially for draft legislation. It should be recognized that any subsequent CBO estimates may differ from the estimates in this memorandum, because of different assumptions about the method of calculating the "full payment amount," about likely future revenue-sharing payments, *etc.*

issues, and alternative proposals, and a brief analysis, see CRS Report RS20178, *Forest Service Receipt-Sharing Payments: Proposals for Change*.

Covered Lands and Programs

In §3, the draft bill defines the covered lands to include the National Forest System and the BLM's O&C and Coos Bay Wagon Road lands.² The defined programs include the Forest Service 25% payments to states and the BLM 50% payments to the O&C counties. However, other programs also exist to compensate state and local governments for the tax exempt status of federal lands. For example, the national grasslands and land utilization projects, established under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937 and which are part of the National Forest System, return 25% of their net receipts directly to the counties where their lands are located. Similarly, 4% of receipts from land, timber, and material sales on the BLM's public lands are returned to the counties. It is unclear whether receipts from these other lands, and where the counties are compensated under different provisions than those listed in the draft bill, have declined sufficiently to warrant inclusion in this "full payment" program.

Additional Cost

The additional cost of the "full payment amount" would depend in part on the geographic basis for calculating the additional payments. The Forest Service payments are particularly sensitive to the geographic base presumed for the calculations. The agency's 25% payments are made to the states for use on the roads and schools in the counties where each national forest is located. The states allocate the funds to road and school programs, but the Forest Service determines the allocation to each local government, based on the acreage of each national forest in each county. (While the payments are made to the states, the states do not retain any of the funds; they are entirely passed through to local governments.)

An example might help clarify this complicated program. The Fremont NF has 1,201,080 acres in two Oregon counties: Klamath County, with 344,593 acres (28.7%), and Lake County, with 856,487 acres (71.3%). Thus, the Fremont's FY1998 25% payment of \$1,233,209.72 was divided between Klamath County (\$353,811.10, or 28.7%) and Lake County (\$879,398.62, or 71.3%). Under Oregon law, 50% of the payment for each county was allocated to school programs, and 50% was allocated to road programs. These counties also contain land in other national forests. Klamath County, for example, also contains 291,412 acres (18.1%) of the Deschutes NF; 65,836 acres (12.8%) of the Rogue River NF; and 1,020,570 (100.0%) of the Winema NF. Thus, Klamath County received a payment from the state for its share of the receipts from four national forests.

This situation — national forests containing multiple counties, and counties containing land from multiple national forests, with payments being funneled through the state — leads to potential uncertainty in calculating the full payment amount. The language in §§3(b), (d), and (f) of the draft suggests that the full payment amount is to be calculated for each state. Specifically, §3(f) directs "calculating the average of the three highest 25 percent payments

² For simplicity, unless otherwise specified, the Coos Bay Wagon Road lands are included in any references to the O&C lands in this memorandum.

... made to the eligible State ...” with eligible state defined in §3(b) as a state receiving the 25% payments, and the payments defined in §3(d) as the Forest Service 25% receipt-sharing payments to states.

There are two other possible levels for determining the three highest 25% payments: the national forest level and the county level. Currently, payments are determined for each national forest, and then allocated among the counties containing the lands of that forest on a *pro rata* basis, based solely on acreage. This may have been intended to be the basis for calculating the full payment amount, because eligible states are defined in §3(b) as “each State that received *one or more* 25 percent payments ...” (emphasis added). This suggests the belief that the states receive a payment from each national forest in the state, which the states then direct to road and school programs in the counties, based on the Forest Service allocation. The Forest Service actually makes two payments — initially at the close of the fiscal year, and then a final payment in December after receipt accounting is completed — to each state, aggregating the payments due from each national forest in a state.

It is also possible to determine the full payment amount at the county level. Because the intended beneficiaries are the counties, the three highest 25% payments could be determined for each county. This is the approach taken for the special “spotted owl” payments in §§13982-13983 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-66). This program was enacted to increase payments to counties where timber receipts had declined precipitously due to protection of northern spotted owls and other values. Counties with the 17 national forests which contain northern spotted owl habitat, and the BLM’s O&C lands, are eligible for guaranteed payments, beginning in FY1994 at 85% of the FY1986-FY1990 average payments, and declining by 3 percentage points annually to 58% of that historic average in FY2003. From FY1999-FY2003, the payments are the greater of the payments under this formula or under the 25% receipt-sharing, determined at the county level.

The BLM payments to the O&C counties are allocated among all O&C counties on a *pro rata* share, based on acreage of O&C lands in each county. (All O&C lands are in the state of Oregon.) Because the *share* of the annual payments to each county is identical, the three years of highest payments to the O&C counties are the same for all counties. Thus, the additional cost of the full payment amount would be the same, regardless of whether the three years of highest payments were determined at the state level or the county level.

Finally, in addition to variation among possible approaches to determining the full payment amount, the calculated additional costs are significantly affected by projections of future revenues. Such projections are necessarily speculative, and actual payments vary by 20% or more from year to year. As a substitute for revenue projections, the additional costs have been calculated as the difference between the full payment amount and the average payments of the past three fiscal years (FY1996-FY1998), and between the full payment amount and the highest and lowest payments of the past three fiscal years, to give a range of possible outcomes. The exception is for the 17 national forests with guaranteed “owl” payments (identified by an asterisk in table 2) and the O&C lands, since future payments are likely to be lower than recent historic payments under the formula in law. For these areas,

the average of the five remaining fiscal years (FY1999-FY2003) under the formula in law was substituted for the average of the past three fiscal years.³

For the Forest Service nationally, the three years with the highest receipt-sharing payments were FY1989 (\$360.9 million), FY1990 (\$344.8 million), and FY1992 (\$322.6 million), with an average payment of \$342.8 million. The average payment for FY1996-FY1998 was \$238.4 million, ranging from \$254.4 million in FY1996 to \$227.8 million in FY1998. If the full payment amount were to be calculated nationally, the additional cost would be about \$104.4 million annually for the national forests, probably ranging from about \$88.3 million to about \$115.0 million.

Table 1, at the end of this memorandum, shows the additional cost for the full payment amount based on the three years with the highest receipt-sharing payments in each state, as appears to be required by the draft language. The table shows the FY1996-FY1998 average, the average of the three highest payments, the years of the three highest payments (in descending order), and the increase in thousand dollars and in percent above the FY1996-FY1998 average. The second page of the table shows the highest and lowest payment in the past three fiscal years, the years in which they occur, and the projected increases for the full payment amount based on those payments. In total, the additional cost (based on state-level determinations) is estimated to be about \$145.5 million (61% above the FY1996-FY1998 average) and probably to range from about \$124.8 million to about \$169.6 million.

Table 2, also at the end of this memorandum, shows the additional cost for the full payment amount based on the three years of highest payments from each national forest. This table shows the same data as table 1, but by national forest rather than by state. In total, the additional cost (based on national forest level determinations) is estimated to be about \$194.9 million, and probably to range from about \$145.0 million to about \$207.4 million. The low-end estimate is substantially farther from the estimate based on the 3-year average, because the "recent high" year is above the average of the three highest years for 42 national forests, half of which are in the west.

Because the current approach to Forest Service receipt-sharing is based on forest level determinations, it is likely to yield the highest possible full payment amount. The additional cost based on county level determinations would probably be between the state level determinations (\$125-\$170 million) and the national forest level determinations (\$145-\$207 million).

Finally, for the O&C lands, the three years with the highest receipt-sharing payments were FY1988 (\$165.8 million), FY1985 (\$125.9 million), and FY1989 (\$110.9 million), with an average payment of \$134.2 million. The average payment for FY1996-FY1998 was \$69.9 million, ranging from \$70.9 million in FY1996 to \$68.0 million in FY1998. However, the projected FY1999-FY2003 average payment, under the formula in law, is calculated to be \$58.9 million annually. Thus, the additional cost for the O&C lands would probably be about \$75.3 million.

³ Because FY1996-FY1998 payments were also based on the formula in law, the projected FY1999-FY2003 average payment was 84.2% of the actual FY1996-FY1998 average payment. Since this reduction is only applied at the national forest level, the "FY1996-FY1998" average in table 2 is lower than in table 1.

Sources of Additional Payments

Sections 4(d) and 5(d) of the draft bill provide direction on the source of funds to be used to make the required payments for the Forest Service and the BLM, respectively. These sections specify that the payments would be derived

... first from any revenues received by the Federal government from activities by the [relevant agency] ... and/or secondly from any unobligated balances remaining as of October 1 of any year from funds appropriated from previous years to the [appropriate] Department ... from funds appropriated for the [agency] ..., except —

- (1) programs from which the ... payments are derived; and
- (2) funds from trust or other special accounts established by statute for use by the [agency] ... for specified purposes.

The language indicates that the agencies are first to use receipts to make the required payments. If receipts are insufficient, then the agencies are to use any existing unobligated balances at the beginning of the fiscal year, but with two exceptions. First, the agencies cannot use unobligated balances from accounts that generate receipts — timber sales, range (grazing) management, mineral leasing, recreation use, *etc.* Second, the agencies cannot use unobligated balances from their trust funds and special accounts.

This direction would seem to require that the required payments (in excess of available receipts) be derived from budget accounts that do not generate receipts. For the Forest Service, this might include: research; financial and technical assistance to states and private landowners; land management planning, inventory, and monitoring; wildlife and fisheries habitat management; soil, water, and air management; landownership management; law enforcement activities; general administration; wildland fire management; land acquisition; and possibly some portion of infrastructure management (road and facility construction and maintenance). For the BLM, this might include: soil, water, and air management; riparian management; cultural resources management; wild horse and burro management; wildlife and fisheries management; threatened and endangered species management; wilderness management; realty and ownership management; resource protection; transportation and facilities maintenance; wildland fire management; payments in lieu of taxes; land acquisition; and possibly some construction. However, legislated direction for use of these funds and resources to meet legal requirements, including court-ordered activities, may preclude the agencies from using some of these funds for their required payments. Likewise, other programs that might be curtailed to provide the funding for the additional required payments have their strong advocates who would register their objection to this implicit reprogramming of funds, and might challenge such funding reallocations.

There is another possible source of funds to provide money for the required payments. It is possible for the agencies to increase the revenues available for the required payments by reducing their deposits to the trust funds and special accounts, despite the direction in the draft language quoted above. Understanding how this is feasible requires understanding how receipts are currently allocated among the various accounts. Thus, the following is a brief digression explaining how the Forest Service currently allocates receipts among accounts. (The BLM follows similar, but not identical, practices.)

The Forest Service currently allocates certain receipts to various trust funds and special accounts, with other receipts deposited in the National Forest Fund (NFF). This Fund is a

receipt account that holds payments made during the year (except those which by law are deposited directly into a special account or trust fund). For some resource sales and leases, the receipt allocation to various accounts is specified; for example, 50% of grazing fees are credited to the Range Betterment Fund. However, the Forest Service determines the amount deposited in each trust fund or special account (potentially including the Salvage Sale Fund, the Knutson-Vandenberg Fund, the brush disposal account, other cooperative work, *etc.*) on each timber sale. While the amount deposited in each account is intended to cover the cost of the required work, in practice, the agency has substantial discretion in allocating funds among accounts. Timber receipts not deposited directly into a trust fund or special account are deposited in the NFF. At the end of the fiscal year, the agency makes required disbursements from the NFF, including the 25% payments to states. Any remaining balance is then transferred to the General Treasury after required disbursements are completed.

Because the Forest Service has discretion over the allocation of timber sale receipts among accounts, the agency could choose to deposit fewer funds into the trust funds and special accounts and more into the NFF. In fact, this has been done in the past. In 1996, Deputy Chief Gray Reynolds sent a memorandum to regional foresters directing them to cease making deposits to trust funds and special accounts, and instead transfer all funds to the NFF to assure that the NFF would have sufficient funds to make the 25% payments.⁴ Specifically, the memo states

A review of the distribution of receipts from Timber Sales indicates that we face a problem for fiscal year 1996 in having sufficient funds available at the appropriate time to pay the counties [sic] 25% receipts....

For the remainder of the fiscal year, all Regions should suspend deposits from Timber Sale Deposit Fund (TSDF) to Trust Funds and make all transfer [sic] to National Forest Fund (NFF).... If necessary, adjustments can be made next fiscal year ...

Regions 1, 4, 5, and 6 need to review the balances in NFF, K-V [Knutson-Vandenberg Fund], and SSF [the Salvage Sale Fund] to help resolve this present problem. These are the Regions that presently have most of their fund distributions going to the Trust fund accounts. First, any deficit in NFF needs to be offset by a transfer of funds from one of the other accounts. In addition, during the next two months of this fiscal year, stop the acceleration of collection of SSF on the August and September Timber Sale Statement of Accounts.

Adjustments to these accounts can be made later in fiscal year 1997. In the meantime, we will be working on a long term solution to assuring that there are sufficient funds available at the appropriate [time] to pay the county receipts [sic]....

We cannot afford to have a deficit in our receipt account at the end of the fiscal year.

It is certainly possible, and seems reasonably likely, that the Forest Service, and perhaps the BLM to the extent feasible, would respond similarly under the provisions of the draft bill. The language would prohibit any explicit use of unobligated balances in the trust funds and special accounts to make the required payments, but the agencies could probably adjust their receipt allocations to assure that sufficient funds are available to make the payments. Such adjustments appear to be within the agencies' discretion. Thus, while the draft bill suggests that the funds would come from resource protection, land acquisition, and other non-revenue programs, the agencies might instead alter how they allocate their receipts to the trust funds and special accounts to preserve resource protection and other funding.

⁴ Gray F. Reynolds, Deputy Chief. *Subject: Timber Sale Receipts*. To: Regional Foresters. File Code: 2400. Route To: 6500. Date: August 27, 1996. Washington, DC. 1 p.

Table 1. Forest Service Payments to States, by State
(in thousands of dollars)

| | 3 Highest Years | Average 3 Highest | 1996-1998 Average | Increase Amount | Percent |
|----------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------|
| Alabama | 86,96,92 | 2,006.4 | 1,382.4 | 624.0 | 45.1% |
| Alaska | 91,90,94 | 9,046.0 | 2,970.8 | 6,075.2 | 204.5% |
| Arizona | 88,89,87 | 7,230.8 | 1,986.5 | 5,244.3 | 264.0% |
| Arkansas | 89,90,96 | 7,630.7 | 6,395.3 | 1,235.4 | 19.3% |
| California | 89,90,88 | 64,821.4 | 33,551.3 | 31,270.1 | 93.2% |
| Colorado | 94,96,95 | 5,952.9 | 5,197.2 | 755.7 | 14.5% |
| Florida | 85,87,89 | 2,629.8 | 1,166.8 | 1,463.0 | 125.4% |
| Georgia | 93,92,86 | 1,206.1 | 645.0 | 561.1 | 87.0% |
| Idaho | 94,93,92 | 22,540.6 | 14,731.1 | 7,809.5 | 53.0% |
| Illinois | 98,87,86 | 246.2 | 146.4 | 99.8 | 68.2% |
| Indiana | 85,86,98 | 163.1 | 57.2 | 106.0 | 185.3% |
| Kentucky | 93,92,91 | 588.3 | 394.1 | 194.3 | 49.3% |
| Louisiana | 93,90,87 | 3,186.5 | 2,681.6 | 504.9 | 15.8% |
| Maine | 93,98,89 | 38.0 | 34.0 | 4.0 | 11.8% |
| Michigan | 98,97,95 | 2,753.2 | 2,713.0 | 40.2 | 1.5% |
| Minnesota | 98,96,95 | 1,923.1 | 1,904.6 | 18.5 | 1.0% |
| Mississippi | 96,95,90 | 7,295.1 | 6,198.2 | 1,096.8 | 17.7% |
| Missouri | 89,90,88 | 2,448.7 | 1,206.0 | 1,242.7 | 103.0% |
| Montana | 94,93,92 | 13,392.2 | 9,436.0 | 3,956.2 | 41.9% |
| Nebraska | 94,92,91 | 51.3 | 31.8 | 19.5 | 61.2% |
| Nevada | 94,92,89 | 441.7 | 338.6 | 103.1 | 30.5% |
| New Hampshire | 93,98,89 | 557.7 | 499.6 | 58.1 | 11.6% |
| New Mexico | 89,88,92 | 2,217.4 | 810.0 | 1,407.4 | 173.7% |
| New York | 89,87,90 | 15.6 | 5.0 | 10.6 | 212.5% |
| North Carolina | 87,95,86 | 943.9 | 646.7 | 297.2 | 46.0% |
| North Dakota | 95,94,92 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 52.2% |
| Ohio | 85,87,89 | 180.1 | 13.8 | 166.3 | 1203.8% |
| Oklahoma | 89,90,98 | 1,125.8 | 978.1 | 147.6 | 15.1% |
| Oregon | 89,90,88 | 152,785.8 | 90,995.6 | 61,790.1 | 67.9% |
| Pennsylvania | 96,97,98 | 6,002.0 | 6,002.0 | 0.0 | 0.0% |
| South Carolina | 90,87,85 | 3,059.8 | 936.6 | 2,123.2 | 226.7% |
| South Dakota | 97,98,93 | 3,622.1 | 3,275.7 | 346.4 | 10.6% |
| Tennessee | 92,93,86 | 501.6 | 362.2 | 139.5 | 38.5% |
| Texas | 98,96,87 | 4,570.4 | 4,074.1 | 496.3 | 12.2% |
| Utah | 94,96,93 | 1,981.0 | 1,647.2 | 333.8 | 20.3% |
| Vermont | 98,96,97 | 306.1 | 306.1 | 0.0 | 0.0% |
| Virginia | 95,96,94 | 879.6 | 793.0 | 86.6 | 10.9% |
| Washington | 89,88,91 | 43,799.2 | 28,285.7 | 15,513.5 | 54.8% |
| West Virginia | 98,96,97 | 1,809.6 | 1,809.6 | 0.0 | 0.0% |
| Wisconsin | 98,97,96 | 1,882.8 | 1,882.8 | 0.0 | 0.0% |
| Wyoming | 93,94,98 | 2,243.9 | 1,959.1 | 284.8 | 14.5% |
| Puerto Rico | 94,98,90 | 24.3 | 22.6 | 1.7 | 7.7% |
| NFS | | 384,021.2 | 238,473.7 | 145,547.5 | 61.0% |

3413 %

Table 1. Forest Service Payments to States, by State
(in thousands of dollars)

| | Recent High | Year | Increase | Recent Low | Year | Increase |
|----------------|----------------|------|-----------|---------------|------|-----------|
| Alabama | 2,049.9 | (96) | 0.0 | 964.4 | (97) | 1,042.0 |
| Alaska | 5,905.5 | (96) | 3,140.5 | 1,186.9 | (97) | 7,859.1 |
| Arizona | 2,214.9 | (97) | 5,015.9 | 1,631.7 | (96) | 5,599.0 |
| Arkansas | 6,648.4 | (96) | 982.4 | 5,954.1 | (97) | 1,676.7 |
| California | 36,157.5 | (96) | 28,663.8 | 30,533.4 | (98) | 34,288.0 |
| Colorado | 5,955.6 | (96) | 0.0 | 4,590.9 | (97) | 1,362.1 |
| Florida | 1,434.6 | (98) | 1,195.2 | 999.5 | (97) | 1,630.3 |
| Georgia | 907.8 | (96) | 298.4 | 328.3 | (98) | 877.8 |
| Idaho | 17,457.7 | (96) | 5,082.9 | 12,468.4 | (98) | 10,072.2 |
| Illinois | 394.1 | (98) | 0.0 | 17.4 | (97) | 228.8 |
| Indiana | 138.3 | (98) | 24.9 | 7.4 | (96) | 155.7 |
| Kentucky | 494.0 | (96) | 94.3 | 254.9 | (98) | 333.5 |
| Louisiana | 2,948.8 | (97) | 157.6 | 2,360.6 | (98) | 745.9 |
| Maine | 37.2 | (98) | 0.8 | 37.2 | (97) | 0.8 |
| Michigan | 2,995.7 | (98) | 0.0 | 2,384.2 | (96) | 369.0 |
| Minnesota | 2,145.8 | (98) | 0.0 | 1,655.2 | (97) | 267.9 |
| Mississippi | 8,276.2 | (96) | 0.0 | 4,919.0 | (97) | 2,376.0 |
| Missouri | 1,237.0 | (98) | 1,211.7 | 1,149.3 | (97) | 1,299.4 |
| Montana | 10,366.7 | (98) | 3,025.6 | 8,558.1 | (97) | 4,834.1 |
| Nebraska | 33.2 | (98) | 18.1 | 30.6 | (96) | 20.7 |
| Nevada | 387.6 | (97) | 54.1 | 298.5 | (96) | 143.2 |
| New Hampshire | 548.5 | (98) | 9.2 | 440.1 | (97) | 117.6 |
| New Mexico | 923.2 | (97) | 1,294.2 | 652.6 | (96) | 1,564.7 |
| New York | 6.4 | (97) | 9.2 | 2.2 | (98) | 13.4 |
| North Carolina | 692.3 | (96) | 251.6 | 594.3 | (98) | 349.6 |
| North Dakota | 0.1 | (96) | 0.0 | 0.1 | (98) | 0.0 |
| Ohio | 16.4 | (97) | 163.7 | 11.4 | (96) | 168.7 |
| Oklahoma | 1,034.4 | (98) | 91.4 | 883.4 | (96) | 242.4 |
| Oregon | 95,239.0 | (96) | 57,546.8 | 85,505.4 | (98) | 67,280.3 |
| Pennsylvania | 6,207.4 | (96) | 0.0 | 5,800.4 | (98) | 201.5 |
| South Carolina | 1,292.4 | (97) | 1,767.4 | 557.2 | (98) | 2,502.6 |
| South Dakota | 3,814.0 | (97) | 0.0 | 2,349.6 | (96) | 1,272.5 |
| Tennessee | 440.1 | (97) | 61.5 | 319.5 | (96) | 182.1 |
| Texas | 5,620.6 | (98) | 0.0 | 2,264.5 | (97) | 2,305.9 |
| Utah | 1,831.2 | (96) | 149.8 | 1,511.6 | (98) | 469.4 |
| Vermont | 435.6 | (98) | 0.0 | 225.9 | (97) | 80.3 |
| Virginia | 822.1 | (96) | 57.5 | 767.4 | (98) | 112.3 |
| Washington | 29,419.4 | (96) | 14,379.9 | 27,050.7 | (98) | 16,748.5 |
| West Virginia | 1,944.3 | (98) | 0.0 | 1,623.5 | (97) | 186.0 |
| Wisconsin | 2,165.8 | (98) | 0.0 | 1,621.4 | (96) | 261.4 |
| Wyoming | 2,184.1 | (98) | 59.8 | 1,844.0 | (96) | 399.9 |
| Puerto Rico | 24.4 | (98) | 0.0 | 20.8 | (96) | 3.5 |
| NFS | 262,848.2 | | 124,808.0 | 214,376.2 | | 169,645.0 |

Table 2. Forest Service Payments to States, by National Forest
(in thousands of dollars)

| | | 3 Highest Years | Average 3 Highest | 1996-1998 Average | Increase Amount | Percent |
|----------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------|
| Region 1 | | | | | | |
| MT | Beaverhead | 96,94,90 | 304.0 | 252.0 | 52.0 | 20.7% |
| MT | Bitterroot | 86,87,89 | 640.9 | 256.9 | 384.0 | 149.5% |
| ID | Clearwater | 94,95,91 | 2,545.7 | 1,071.9 | 1,473.8 | 137.5% |
| ID | Coeur d'Alene | 92,94,96 | 2,513.8 | 1,984.3 | 529.5 | 26.7% |
| MT | Custer | 95,94,92 | 164.3 | 108.1 | 56.3 | 52.1% |
| MT | Deerlodge | 98,95,94 | 504.4 | 385.4 | 119.0 | 30.9% |
| MT | Flathead | 88,93,92 | 2,010.1 | 905.4 | 1,104.7 | 122.0% |
| MT | Gallatin | 94,97,96 | 319.5 | 236.4 | 83.1 | 35.2% |
| MT | Helena | 98,97,95 | 499.7 | 455.6 | 44.1 | 9.7% |
| ID | Kaniksu | 92,95,94 | 3,840.1 | 2,608.0 | 1,232.0 | 47.2% |
| MT | Kootenai | 93,94,92 | 6,378.1 | 3,849.4 | 2,528.6 | 65.7% |
| MT | Lewis & Clark | 98,94,95 | 681.4 | 574.4 | 107.0 | 18.6% |
| MT | Lolo | 94,93,90 | 3,086.5 | 1,868.0 | 1,218.4 | 65.2% |
| ID | Nez Perce | 94,93,92 | 2,704.6 | 1,250.9 | 1,453.7 | 116.2% |
| ID | St. Joe | 93,90,92 | 2,304.4 | 1,473.7 | 830.7 | 56.4% |
| | Regional Office | | 28,497.5 | 17,280.5 | 11,217.0 | 64.9% |
| Region 2 | | | | | | |
| CO | Arapaho | 98,96,95 | 1,367.3 | 1,350.1 | 17.2 | 1.3% |
| WY | Bighorn | 93,96,92 | 304.5 | 246.1 | 58.4 | 23.7% |
| SD | Black Hills | 97,98,93 | 4,207.4 | 3,804.1 | 403.3 | 10.6% |
| CO | Grand Mesa | 98,94,95 | 165.9 | 135.5 | 30.4 | 22.5% |
| CO | Gunnison | 94,98,97 | 338.8 | 288.2 | 50.5 | 17.5% |
| WY | Medicine Bow | 98,94,92 | 665.0 | 411.0 | 254.0 | 61.8% |
| NB | Nebraska | 94,92,91 | 35.4 | 20.6 | 14.8 | 71.7% |
| CO | Pike | 93,94,98 | 161.3 | 115.0 | 46.4 | 40.3% |
| CO | Rio Grande | 95,94,93 | 771.7 | 218.0 | 553.7 | 254.0% |
| CO | Roosevelt | 93,94,89 | 168.1 | 90.1 | 78.0 | 86.6% |
| CO | Routt | 96,94,97 | 846.1 | 736.8 | 109.3 | 14.8% |
| NB | Sam R. McKelvie | 89,90,94 | 17.2 | 11.2 | 6.0 | 53.7% |
| CO | San Isabel | 94,92,93 | 167.8 | 137.1 | 30.7 | 22.4% |
| CO | San Juan | 93,94,92 | 552.0 | 322.9 | 229.2 | 71.0% |
| WY | Shoshone | 88,92,96 | 277.3 | 209.7 | 67.6 | 32.2% |
| CO | Uncompahgre | 94,98,93 | 254.9 | 172.5 | 82.4 | 47.8% |
| CO | White River | 96,98,94 | 1,706.8 | 1,668.8 | 38.0 | 2.3% |
| | Regional Office | | 12,007.5 | 9,937.7 | 2,069.8 | 20.8% |

Table 2. Forest Service Payments to States, by National Forest
(in thousands of dollars)

| | | Recent | | Recent | |
|----------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | | High | Year Increase | Low | Year Increase |
| Region 1 | | | | | |
| MT | Beaverhead | 368.7 (96) | 0.0 | 181.1 (98) | 122.9 |
| MT | Bitterroot | 291.3 (97) | 349.6 | 229.7 (96) | 411.2 |
| ID | Clearwater | 1,360.5 (97) | 1,185.2 | 505.0 (96) | 2,040.7 |
| ID | Coeur d'Alene | 2,392.2 (96) | 121.6 | 1,472.0 (97) | 1,041.8 |
| MT | Custer | 131.1 (96) | 33.2 | 91.7 (98) | 72.7 |
| MT | Deerlodge | 526.0 (98) | 0.0 | 297.6 (97) | 206.9 |
| MT | Flathead | 1,084.1 (98) | 926.0 | 720.1 (97) | 1,290.0 |
| MT | Gallatin | 296.7 (97) | 22.8 | 145.5 (98) | 174.0 |
| MT | Helena | 552.3 (98) | 0.0 | 316.7 (96) | 183.0 |
| ID | Kaniksu | 3,227.1 (96) | 613.0 | 1,797.3 (97) | 2,042.8 |
| MT | Kootenai | 4,190.2 (96) | 2,187.9 | 3,548.9 (97) | 2,829.2 |
| MT | Lewis & Clark | 940.2 (98) | 0.0 | 265.2 (97) | 416.2 |
| MT | Lolo | 2,181.4 (98) | 905.1 | 1,408.9 (96) | 1,677.6 |
| ID | Nez Perce | 1,576.7 (96) | 1,127.9 | 714.9 (97) | 1,989.8 |
| ID | St. Joe | 1,862.8 (96) | 441.6 | 1,036.3 (98) | 1,268.1 |
| | Regional Office | 20,981.2 | 7,913.9 | 12,730.8 | 15,766.7 |
| Region 2 | | | | | |
| CO | Arapaho | 1,443.5 (98) | 0.0 | 1,170.6 (97) | 196.8 |
| WY | Bighorn | 290.3 (96) | 14.2 | 218.0 (98) | 86.5 |
| SD | Black Hills | 4,431.0 (97) | 0.0 | 2,724.8 (96) | 1,482.6 |
| CO | Grand Mesa | 177.0 (98) | 0.0 | 99.7 (97) | 66.2 |
| CO | Gunnison | 332.8 (98) | 6.0 | 200.0 (97) | 138.8 |
| WY | Medicine Bow | 721.1 (98) | 0.0 | 244.3 (96) | 420.7 |
| NB | Nebraska | 22.1 (98) | 13.3 | 19.3 (96) | 16.1 |
| CO | Pike | 157.9 (98) | 3.5 | 92.6 (97) | 68.8 |
| CO | Rio Grande | 364.0 (96) | 407.7 | 108.9 (98) | 662.8 |
| CO | Roosevelt | 107.7 (97) | 60.4 | 77.7 (96) | 90.4 |
| CO | Routt | 900.4 (96) | 0.0 | 502.4 (98) | 343.7 |
| NB | Sam R. McKelvie | 11.3 (97) | 5.9 | 11.1 (98) | 6.1 |
| CO | San Isabel | 149.1 (98) | 18.7 | 120.2 (97) | 47.6 |
| CO | San Juan | 443.3 (96) | 108.7 | 202.4 (98) | 349.6 |
| WY | Shoshone | 259.5 (96) | 17.8 | 160.5 (98) | 116.8 |
| CO | Uncompahgre | 263.6 (98) | 0.0 | 115.4 (97) | 139.5 |
| CO | White River | 1,893.1 (96) | 0.0 | 1,494.5 (97) | 212.3 |
| | Regional Office | 11,967.6 | 656.1 | 7,562.3 | 4,445.2 |

Table 2. Forest Service Payments to States, by National Forest
(in thousands of dollars)

| | | 3 Highest Years | Average 3 Highest | 1996-1998 Average | Increase Amount | Percent |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------|
| Region 3 | | | | | | |
| AZ | Apache | 89,88,92 | 1,766.3 | 234.2 | 1,532.1 | 654.1% |
| NM | Carson | 86,89,90 | 401.3 | 173.4 | 227.9 | 131.4% |
| NM | Cibola | 88,86,91 | 263.3 | 158.9 | 104.5 | 65.8% |
| AZ | Coconino | 87,89,88 | 2,744.2 | 370.2 | 2,373.9 | 641.2% |
| AZ | Coronado | 93,92,91 | 247.3 | 191.6 | 55.7 | 29.1% |
| NM | Gila | 89,92,88 | 422.8 | 106.4 | 316.5 | 297.6% |
| AZ | Kaibab | 86,88,87 | 1,614.3 | 482.5 | 1,131.8 | 234.6% |
| NM | Lincoln | 90,94,87 | 163.0 | 105.8 | 57.2 | 54.1% |
| AZ | Prescott | 97,89,94 | 177.5 | 160.2 | 17.4 | 10.8% |
| NM | Santa Fe | 89,87,88 | 539.4 | 178.9 | 360.6 | 201.6% |
| AZ | Sitgreaves | 93,88,89 | 1,424.1 | 312.9 | 1,111.2 | 355.1% |
| AZ | Tonto | 94,95,90 | 546.0 | 321.7 | 224.3 | 69.7% |
| Regional Office | | | 10,309.6 | 2,796.5 | 7,513.1 | 268.7% |
| Region 4 | | | | | | |
| UT | Ashley | 94,96,95 | 343.4 | 258.5 | 84.9 | 32.8% |
| ID | Boise | 93,94,96 | 6,612.2 | 2,952.0 | 3,660.1 | 124.0% |
| ID | Bridger | 95,96,88 | 268.9 | 197.8 | 71.1 | 35.9% |
| UT | Cache | 97,90,98 | 327.2 | 292.9 | 34.3 | 11.7% |
| ID | Caribou | 98,97,88 | 225.0 | 219.6 | 5.5 | 2.5% |
| ID | Challis | 93,94,96 | 197.1 | 116.4 | 80.6 | 69.3% |
| UT | Dixie | 94,90,96 | 649.2 | 383.7 | 265.6 | 69.2% |
| UT | Fishlake | 98,93,97 | 211.3 | 197.6 | 13.8 | 7.0% |
| NV | Humboldt | 91,89,90 | 100.3 | 69.2 | 31.1 | 45.0% |
| UT | Manti-LaSal | 98,96,95 | 166.9 | 164.9 | 2.0 | 1.2% |
| ID | Payette | 97,92,96 | 3,724.8 | 3,287.9 | 436.9 | 13.3% |
| ID | Salmon | 92,93,94 | 664.8 | 245.6 | 419.1 | 170.6% |
| ID | Sawtooth | 94,96,95 | 352.1 | 232.9 | 119.2 | 51.2% |
| ID | Targhee | 90,91,89 | 553.2 | 206.6 | 346.6 | 167.8% |
| ID | Teton | 93,96,97 | 350.9 | 284.1 | 66.7 | 23.5% |
| NV | Toiyabe | 94,97,92 | 415.6 | 306.7 | 108.9 | 35.5% |
| UT | Uinta | 94,93,95 | 286.8 | 167.2 | 119.7 | 71.6% |
| UT | Wasatch | 92,96,94 | 407.7 | 321.7 | 86.0 | 26.7% |
| Regional Office | | | 15,857.5 | 9,905.3 | 5,952.1 | 60.1% |

Table 2. Forest Service Payments to States, by National Forest
(in thousands of dollars)

| | | Recent | | Recent | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|----------|---------------|---------|---------------|--|--|
| | | High | Year Increase | Low | Year Increase | | |
| Region 3 | | | | | | | |
| AZ | Apache | 347.9 | (97) 1,418.4 | 161.8 | (96) 1,604.4 | | |
| NM | Carson | 188.0 | (96) 213.3 | 163.5 | (97) 237.7 | | |
| NM | Cibola | 214.0 | (97) 49.3 | 79.3 | (96) 184.0 | | |
| AZ | Coconino | 420.9 | (97) 2,323.3 | 281.2 | (96) 2,463.0 | | |
| AZ | Coronado | 200.0 | (97) 47.3 | 183.4 | (96) 63.9 | | |
| NM | Gila | 107.0 | (98) 315.8 | 105.7 | (97) 317.1 | | |
| AZ | Kaibab | 658.9 | (98) 955.4 | 230.2 | (96) 1,384.1 | | |
| NM | Lincoln | 129.5 | (98) 33.5 | 84.2 | (96) 78.8 | | |
| AZ | Prescott | 251.6 | (97) 0.0 | 109.2 | (98) 68.3 | | |
| NM | Santa Fe | 210.7 | (97) 328.7 | 132.9 | (96) 406.6 | | |
| AZ | Sitgreaves | 399.4 | (96) 1,024.8 | 261.4 | (97) 1,162.7 | | |
| AZ | Tonto | 346.7 | (98) 199.3 | 300.4 | (97) 245.6 | | |
| Regional Office | | 3,474.4 | 6,909.2 | 2,093.3 | 8,216.3 | | |
| Region 4 | | | | | | | |
| UT | Ashley | 346.7 | (96) 0.0 | 161.2 | (97) 182.2 | | |
| ID | Boise | 4,618.9 | (96) 1,993.3 | 1,368.2 | (98) 5,244.0 | | |
| ID | Bridger | 258.5 | (96) 10.5 | 166.9 | (97) 102.1 | | |
| UT | Cache | 415.3 | (97) 0.0 | 188.9 | (96) 138.3 | | |
| ID | Caribou | 237.3 | (98) 0.0 | 199.5 | (96) 25.6 | | |
| ID | Challis | 147.5 | (96) 49.6 | 74.7 | (97) 122.4 | | |
| UT | Dixie | 491.5 | (96) 157.8 | 268.5 | (98) 380.7 | | |
| UT | Fishlake | 247.4 | (98) 0.0 | 154.9 | (96) 56.4 | | |
| NV | Humboldt | 73.0 | (96) 27.4 | 64.9 | (97) 35.4 | | |
| UT | Manti-LaSal | 189.1 | (98) 0.0 | 117.6 | (97) 49.3 | | |
| ID | Payette | 4,010.5 | (97) 0.0 | 2,433.9 | (98) 1,290.9 | | |
| ID | Salmon | 293.1 | (97) 371.7 | 213.0 | (96) 451.8 | | |
| ID | Sawtooth | 315.0 | (96) 37.1 | 160.3 | (98) 191.9 | | |
| ID | Targhee | 221.9 | (97) 331.3 | 183.9 | (98) 369.3 | | |
| ID | Teton | 321.7 | (96) 29.1 | 250.1 | (98) 100.8 | | |
| NV | Toiyabe | 379.6 | (97) 36.0 | 248.5 | (96) 167.1 | | |
| UT | Uinta | 177.1 | (97) 109.8 | 151.7 | (96) 135.1 | | |
| UT | Wasatch | 415.3 | (96) 0.0 | 223.9 | (98) 183.8 | | |
| Regional Office | | 13,159.4 | 3,153.5 | 6,630.6 | 9,226.9 | | |

Table 2. Forest Service Payments to States, by National Forest
(in thousands of dollars)

| | | 3 Highest Years | Average 3 Highest | 1996-1998 Average | Increase Amount | Percent |
|----------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------|
| Region 5 | | | | | | |
| CA | Angeles | 98,97,94 | 497.5 | 492.5 | 5.0 | 1.0% |
| CA | Cleveland | 97,95,92 | 169.7 | 159.5 | 10.2 | 6.4% |
| CA | Eldorado | 94,93,89 | 6,309.5 | 1,593.3 | 4,716.2 | 296.0% |
| CA | Inyo | 95,92,89 | 1,173.0 | 774.0 | 399.1 | 51.6% |
| CA | Klamath | 89,86,90 | 5,627.8 | 3,333.8 * | 2,294.0 | 68.8% |
| CA | Lassen | 86,87,89 | 9,675.5 | 2,850.6 | 6,824.9 | 239.4% |
| CA | Los Padres | 93,92,95 | 175.5 | 132.8 | 42.6 | 32.1% |
| CA | Mendocino | 88,89,92 | 3,378.0 | 1,845.5 * | 1,532.5 | 83.0% |
| CA | Modoc | 90,87,89 | 3,750.7 | 2,485.4 | 1,265.3 | 50.9% |
| CA | Plumas | 92,88,91 | 8,605.0 | 2,251.7 | 6,353.3 | 282.2% |
| CA | San Bernardino | 92,98,95 | 367.9 | 297.5 | 70.4 | 23.7% |
| CA | Sequoia | 93,92,86 | 1,856.8 | 728.0 | 1,128.8 | 155.1% |
| CA | Shasta | 90,92,88 | 4,629.8 | 2,418.1 * | 2,211.7 | 91.5% |
| CA | Sierra | 90,89,93 | 4,603.0 | 1,848.8 | 2,754.2 | 149.0% |
| CA | Six Rivers | 89,88,90 | 5,913.1 | 3,217.0 * | 2,696.0 | 83.8% |
| CA | Stanislaus | 88,93,92 | 4,408.2 | 1,314.4 | 3,093.8 | 235.4% |
| CA | Tahoe | 88,89,90 | 4,518.6 | 1,501.1 | 3,017.5 | 201.0% |
| CA | Trinity | 90,88,89 | 5,386.8 | 2,965.7 * | 2,421.1 | 81.6% |
| | Regional Office | | 71,046.4 | 30,209.8 | 40,836.6 | 135.2% |
| Region 6 | | | | | | |
| WA | Colville | 89,91,92 | 1,972.1 | 1,206.0 | 766.1 | 63.5% |
| OR | Deschutes | 85,86,87 | 7,811.5 | 4,237.0 * | 3,574.6 | 84.4% |
| OR | Fremont | 87,93,92 | 8,425.6 | 1,440.3 | 6,985.2 | 485.0% |
| WA | Gifford Pinchot | 88,89,91 | 16,477.8 | 8,812.0 * | 7,665.8 | 87.0% |
| OR | Malheur | 92,90,91 | 12,536.7 | 2,340.4 | 10,196.3 | 435.7% |
| WA | Mt. Baker | 88,89,91 | 4,406.9 | 2,462.7 * | 1,944.2 | 78.9% |
| OR | Mt. Hood | 88,89,90 | 13,438.6 | 8,079.9 * | 5,358.7 | 66.3% |
| OR | Ochoco | 91,92,86 | 9,051.4 | 811.8 | 8,239.6 | 1015.0% |
| WA | Okanogan | 89,88,92 | 2,268.2 | 1,156.9 * | 1,111.3 | 96.1% |
| WA | Olympic | 89,88,90 | 6,669.7 | 3,746.4 * | 2,923.3 | 78.0% |
| OR | Rogue River | 89,88,87 | 8,633.3 | 5,032.2 * | 3,601.0 | 71.6% |
| OR | Siskiyou | 89,88,90 | 8,771.8 | 4,975.7 * | 3,796.1 | 76.3% |
| OR | Siuslaw | 89,88,86 | 17,818.3 | 10,214.6 * | 7,603.7 | 74.4% |
| WA | Snoqualmie | 89,91,90 | 7,811.7 | 4,134.7 * | 3,676.9 | 88.9% |
| OR | Umatilla | 92,89,90 | 4,751.9 | 1,583.7 | 3,168.2 | 200.1% |
| OR | Umpqua | 90,89,87 | 21,402.3 | 11,319.1 * | 10,083.2 | 89.1% |
| OR | Wallowa | 90,89,88 | 1,643.6 | 312.7 | 1,331.0 | 425.7% |
| WA | Wenatchee | 89,86,88 | 3,026.0 | 1,834.8 * | 1,191.2 | 64.9% |
| OR | Whitman | 90,89,94 | 2,159.2 | 833.9 | 1,325.3 | 158.9% |
| OR | Willamette | 89,90,88 | 36,665.7 | 21,140.6 * | 15,525.1 | 73.4% |
| OR | Winema | 93,89,88 | 13,347.7 | 6,365.0 * | 6,982.7 | 109.7% |
| | Regional Office | | 209,089.8 | 102,040.2 | 107,049.6 | 104.9% |

Table 2. Forest Service Payments to States, by National Forest
(in thousands of dollars)

| | Recent High | Year | Increase | Recent Low | Year | Increase |
|--------------------|----------------|------|----------|---------------|------|----------|
| Region 5 | | | | | | |
| CA Angeles | 620.2 | (98) | 0.0 | 352.7 | (96) | 144.7 |
| CA Cleveland | 181.2 | (97) | 0.0 | 141.5 | (96) | 28.2 |
| CA Eldorado | 2,020.3 | (98) | 4,289.3 | 1,374.9 | (97) | 4,934.6 |
| CA Inyo | 863.3 | (96) | 309.8 | 614.5 | (97) | 558.5 |
| CA Klamath | 4,115.1 | (96) | 1,512.6 | 3,802.6 | (98) | 1,825.2 |
| CA Lassen | 3,714.8 | (97) | 5,960.7 | 2,134.3 | (98) | 7,541.2 |
| CA Los Padres | 161.7 | (97) | 13.8 | 105.9 | (96) | 69.6 |
| CA Mendocino | 2,278.1 | (96) | 1,099.9 | 2,105.1 | (98) | 1,272.9 |
| CA Modoc | 2,583.5 | (96) | 1,167.2 | 2,387.3 | (98) | 1,363.4 |
| CA Plumas | 3,925.2 | (96) | 4,679.8 | 1,384.6 | (97) | 7,220.4 |
| CA San Bernardino | 349.2 | (98) | 18.7 | 263.5 | (96) | 104.4 |
| CA Sequoia | 992.4 | (96) | 864.4 | 252.0 | (98) | 1,604.8 |
| CA Shasta | 2,984.9 | (96) | 1,644.9 | 2,758.2 | (98) | 1,871.6 |
| CA Sierra | 2,531.5 | (96) | 2,071.5 | 1,315.3 | (98) | 3,287.8 |
| CA Six Rivers | 3,971.0 | (96) | 1,942.1 | 3,669.4 | (98) | 2,243.7 |
| CA Stanislaus | 1,459.9 | (97) | 2,948.4 | 1,101.6 | (98) | 3,306.6 |
| CA Tahoe | 2,021.9 | (97) | 2,496.7 | 1,146.0 | (96) | 3,372.6 |
| CA Trinity | 3,660.8 | (96) | 1,726.0 | 3,382.8 | (98) | 2,004.0 |
| Regional Office | 38,435.0 | | 32,745.6 | 28,292.1 | | 42,754.3 |
| Region 6 | | | | | | |
| WA Colville | 1,242.8 | (97) | 729.2 | 1,180.8 | (98) | 791.2 |
| OR Deschutes | 5,229.4 | (96) | 2,582.1 | 4,833.1 | (98) | 2,978.4 |
| OR Fremont | 1,997.8 | (97) | 6,427.8 | 1,090.0 | (96) | 7,335.6 |
| WA Gifford Pinchot | 10,874.6 | (96) | 5,603.1 | 10,052.4 | (98) | 6,425.3 |
| OR Malheur | 3,332.5 | (96) | 9,204.2 | 1,596.6 | (98) | 10,940.1 |
| WA Mt. Baker | 3,039.9 | (96) | 1,367.0 | 2,809.0 | (98) | 1,597.9 |
| OR Mt. Hood | 9,973.6 | (96) | 3,465.0 | 9,216.1 | (98) | 4,222.5 |
| OR Ochoco | 1,180.0 | (96) | 7,871.4 | 309.3 | (98) | 8,742.1 |
| WA Okanogan | 1,428.1 | (96) | 840.1 | 1,319.6 | (98) | 948.6 |
| WA Olympic | 4,624.3 | (96) | 2,045.4 | 4,273.1 | (98) | 2,396.6 |
| OR Rogue River | 6,211.6 | (96) | 2,421.6 | 5,739.9 | (98) | 2,893.4 |
| OR Siskiyou | 6,141.9 | (96) | 2,630.0 | 5,675.4 | (98) | 3,096.4 |
| OR Siuslaw | 12,608.6 | (96) | 5,209.7 | 11,651.0 | (98) | 6,167.3 |
| WA Snoqualmie | 5,106.4 | (96) | 2,705.3 | 4,714.9 | (98) | 3,096.8 |
| OR Umatilla | 2,478.9 | (97) | 2,273.1 | 670.0 | (98) | 4,081.9 |
| OR Umpqua | 13,972.0 | (96) | 7,430.3 | 12,910.9 | (98) | 8,491.3 |
| OR Wallowa | 460.9 | (98) | 1,182.7 | 185.9 | (96) | 1,457.8 |
| WA Wenatchee | 2,264.9 | (96) | 761.1 | 2,092.9 | (98) | 933.2 |
| OR Whitman | 961.1 | (97) | 1,198.1 | 677.0 | (98) | 1,482.2 |
| OR Willamette | 26,096.0 | (96) | 10,569.7 | 24,113.2 | (98) | 12,552.5 |
| OR Winema | 7,856.8 | (96) | 5,490.9 | 7,260.1 | (98) | 6,087.6 |
| Regional Office | 127,082.0 | | 82,007.8 | 112,371.1 | | 96,718.7 |

Table 2. Forest Service Payments to States, by National Forest
(in thousands of dollars)

| | | 3 Highest Years | Average 3 Highest | 1996-1998 Average | Increase Amount | Percent |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------|
| Region 8 | | | | | | |
| TX | Angelina | 87,98,86 | 871.0 | 612.2 | 258.9 | 42.3% |
| FL | Apalachicola | 85,87,89 | 1,110.1 | 204.5 | 905.6 | 442.8% |
| MS | Bienville | 95,86,93 | 1,648.8 | 1,001.0 | 647.8 | 64.7% |
| PR | Caribbean | 94,98,90 | 24.3 | 22.6 | 1.7 | 7.7% |
| GA | Chattahoochee | 95,93,92 | 700.5 | 485.4 | 215.1 | 44.3% |
| TN | Cherokee | 92,93,86 | 501.9 | 362.3 | 139.5 | 38.5% |
| FL | Choctawhatchee | 92,90,93 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 12.8% |
| AL | Conecuh | 96,86,85 | 661.9 | 475.7 | 186.2 | 39.1% |
| NC | Croatan | 85,87,89 | 191.6 | 106.7 | 84.8 | 79.5% |
| KY | Daniel Boone | 93,92,91 | 654.6 | 393.7 | 260.9 | 66.3% |
| TX | Davy Crockett | 96,86,87 | 1,959.8 | 1,065.1 | 894.7 | 84.0% |
| MS | De Soto | 96,94,85 | 2,460.9 | 2,313.8 | 147.1 | 6.4% |
| MS | Delta | 92,94,88 | 120.4 | 64.2 | 56.2 | 87.6% |
| SC | Francis Marion | 90,85,87 | 1,558.7 | 147.8 | 1,410.9 | 954.4% |
| VA | Geo. Washington | 95,98,94 | 628.6 | 568.1 | 60.6 | 10.7% |
| MS | Holly Spring | 96,93,91 | 859.6 | 617.3 | 242.3 | 39.2% |
| MS | Homochitto | 96,95,90 | 2,504.3 | 2,041.4 | 462.9 | 22.7% |
| VA | Jefferson | 95,96,97 | 351.4 | 288.8 | 62.6 | 21.7% |
| LA | Kisatchee | 93,90,87 | 3,106.5 | 2,681.6 | 424.8 | 15.8% |
| NC | Nantahala | 95,86,87 | 437.2 | 301.0 | 136.2 | 45.2% |
| FL | Ocala | 95,98,85 | 1,049.4 | 818.2 | 231.1 | 28.2% |
| GA | Oconee | 91,86,90 | 625.0 | 159.6 | 465.4 | 291.6% |
| FL | Osceola | 87,85,88 | 550.6 | 142.8 | 407.8 | 285.6% |
| AR | Ouachita | 89,90,96 | 6,917.0 | 5,373.3 | 1,543.7 | 28.7% |
| AR | Ozark | 98,96,89 | 1,944.5 | 1,928.7 | 15.8 | 0.8% |
| NC | Pisgah | 95,89,87 | 345.1 | 201.4 | 143.7 | 71.3% |
| TX | Sabine | 98,92,91 | 2,211.0 | 1,713.5 | 497.6 | 29.0% |
| TX | Sam Houston | 93,96,94 | 901.7 | 683.3 | 218.4 | 32.0% |
| AR | St. Francis | 90,97,89 | 104.4 | 71.5 | 33.0 | 46.1% |
| SC | Sumter | 87,92,89 | 1,701.0 | 788.8 | 912.2 | 115.6% |
| AL | Talladega | 86,85,95 | 1,012.1 | 630.4 | 381.7 | 60.5% |
| MS | Tombigbee | 93,94,91 | 418.8 | 160.3 | 258.5 | 161.2% |
| AL | Tuskagee | 89,95,94 | 83.1 | 11.5 | 71.5 | 620.8% |
| NC | Uwharrie | 92,86,93 | 88.3 | 37.4 | 50.9 | 136.0% |
| AL | Wm. Bankhead | 92,93,90 | 496.6 | 264.8 | 231.8 | 87.6% |
| Regional Office | | | 38,802.2 | 26,740.3 | 12,061.9 | 45.1% |

Table 2. Forest Service Payments to States, by National Forest
(in thousands of dollars)

| | | Recent | | Recent | |
|-----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | | High | Year Increase | Low | Year Increase |
| Region 8 | | | | | |
| TX | Angelina | 877.4 (98) | 0.0 | 470.4 (96) | 400.6 |
| FL | Apalachicola | 263.5 (96) | 846.6 | 135.9 (97) | 974.3 |
| MS | Bienville | 1,066.0 (97) | 582.8 | 940.8 (98) | 708.0 |
| PR | Caribbean | 24.4 (98) | 0.0 | 20.8 (96) | 3.5 |
| GA | Chattahoochee | 653.9 (96) | 46.6 | 275.9 (98) | 424.7 |
| TN | Cherokee | 440.4 (97) | 61.5 | 319.6 (96) | 182.2 |
| FL | Choctawhatchee | 1.3 (98) | 0.2 | 1.3 (98) | 0.2 |
| AL | Conecuh | 1,087.5 (96) | 0.0 | 129.9 (98) | 531.9 |
| NC | Croatan | 135.7 (98) | 55.9 | 54.7 (96) | 136.8 |
| KY | Daniel Boone | 493.6 (96) | 161.0 | 254.6 (98) | 400.0 |
| TX | Davy Crockett | 2,464.1 (96) | 0.0 | 215.6 (98) | 1,744.2 |
| MS | De Soto | 2,843.3 (96) | 0.0 | 2,026.9 (98) | 434.1 |
| MS | Delta | 78.9 (97) | 41.6 | 52.9 (96) | 67.6 |
| SC | Francis Marion | 271.8 (97) | 1,286.9 | 51.8 (98) | 1,506.9 |
| VA | Geo.Washington | 611.5 (98) | 17.2 | 537.9 (97) | 90.7 |
| MS | Holly Spring | 1,207.2 (96) | 0.0 | 251.1 (97) | 608.6 |
| MS | Homochitto | 2,888.0 (96) | 0.0 | 1,389.7 (97) | 1,114.6 |
| VA | Jefferson | 330.9 (96) | 20.5 | 222.2 (98) | 129.2 |
| LA | Kisatchee | 2,948.8 (97) | 157.6 | 2,360.6 (98) | 745.9 |
| NC | Nantahala | 373.9 (96) | 63.3 | 252.0 (98) | 185.2 |
| FL | Ocala | 1,067.7 (98) | 0.0 | 578.3 (96) | 471.1 |
| GA | Oconee | 253.9 (96) | 371.2 | 52.5 (98) | 572.6 |
| FL | Osceola | 223.3 (96) | 327.3 | 53.7 (97) | 496.9 |
| AR | Ouachita | 5,692.0 (96) | 1,225.0 | 5,196.9 (97) | 1,720.1 |
| AR | Ozark | 2,311.4 (98) | 0.0 | 1,674.1 (97) | 270.4 |
| NC | Pisgah | 251.1 (96) | 93.9 | 159.1 (98) | 186.0 |
| TX | Sabine | 4,048.5 (98) | 0.0 | 450.3 (96) | 1,760.7 |
| TX | Sam Houston | 952.5 (96) | 0.0 | 479.1 (98) | 422.6 |
| AR | St. Francis | 99.7 (97) | 4.7 | 39.1 (96) | 65.3 |
| SC | Sumter | 1,020.5 (97) | 680.5 | 505.4 (98) | 1,195.6 |
| AL | Talladega | 740.9 (98) | 271.2 | 555.7 (97) | 456.4 |
| MS | Tombigbee | 288.5 (96) | 130.3 | 62.0 (97) | 356.8 |
| AL | Tuskagee | 34.2 (96) | 48.8 | 0.0 (98) | 83.1 |
| NC | Uwharrie | 52.4 (97) | 35.9 | 12.4 (96) | 75.9 |
| AL | Wm.Bankhead | 333.4 (96) | 163.1 | 198.8 (97) | 297.7 |
| Regional Office | | 36,432.2 | 6,693.6 | 19,981.7 | 18,820.5 |

Table 2. Forest Service Payments to States, by National Forest
(in thousands of dollars)

| | | 3 Highest Years | Average 3 Highest | 1996-1998 Average | Increase Amount | Percent |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------|
| Region 9 | | | | | | |
| PA | Allegheny | 96,97,98 | 6,002.0 | 6,002.0 | 0.0 | 0.0% |
| WI | Chequamegon | 98,97,96 | 1,094.5 | 1,094.5 | 0.0 | 0.0% |
| MN | Chippewa | 98,96,97 | 1,077.7 | 1,077.7 | 0.0 | 0.0% |
| NY | Finger Lakes | 89,87,90 | 15.6 | 5.0 | 10.6 | 212.5% |
| VT | Green Mountain | 98,96,97 | 306.1 | 306.1 | 0.0 | 0.0% |
| MI | Hiawatha | 95,96,97 | 810.4 | 746.2 | 64.1 | 8.6% |
| IN | Hoosier | 85,86,98 | 163.1 | 57.2 | 106.0 | 185.3% |
| MI | Huron | 89,92,90 | 598.6 | 371.7 | 226.9 | 61.0% |
| MI | Manistee | 97,98,95 | 615.9 | 606.7 | 9.1 | 1.5% |
| MO | Mark Twain | 89,90,88 | 2,448.7 | 1,206.0 | 1,242.7 | 103.0% |
| WV | Monongahela | 98,96,97 | 1,746.2 | 1,746.2 | 0.0 | 0.0% |
| WI | Nicolet | 98,96,95 | 790.6 | 788.3 | 2.3 | 0.3% |
| MI | Ottawa | 98,97,95 | 1,003.3 | 988.3 | 15.0 | 1.5% |
| IL | Shawnee | 87,86,85 | 147.0 | 21.2 | 125.8 | 594.9% |
| MN | Superior | 98,96,95 | 850.7 | 826.9 | 23.7 | 2.9% |
| OH | Wayne | 85,87,89 | 180.1 | 13.8 | 166.3 | 1203.8% |
| NH | White Mountain | 98,89,91 | 570.1 | 533.6 | 36.5 | 6.8% |
| | Regional Office | | 18,420.4 | 16,391.3 | 2,029.1 | 12.4% |
| Region 10 | | | | | | |
| AK | Chugach | 93,88,98 | 107.2 | 61.9 | 45.4 | 73.3% |
| AK | Tongass | 91,90,94 | 8,990.3 | 2,909.0 | 6,081.3 | 209.1% |
| | Regional Office | | 9,097.5 | 2,970.8 | 6,126.7 | 206.2% |
| NFS Total | | | 413,128.4 | 218,272.5 | 194,855.8 | 89.3% |

Table 2. Forest Service Payments to States, by National Forest
(in thousands of dollars)

| | | Recent | | | Recent | | |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------|------|-----------|-----------|------|-----------|
| | | High | Year | Increase | Low | Year | Increase |
| Region 9 | | | | | | | |
| PA | Allegheny | 6,207.4 | (96) | 0.0 | 5,800.4 | (98) | 201.5 |
| WI | Chequamegon | 1,230.8 | (98) | 0.0 | 895.1 | (96) | 199.3 |
| MN | Chippewa | 1,258.1 | (98) | 0.0 | 959.8 | (97) | 117.9 |
| NY | Finger Lakes | 6.4 | (97) | 9.2 | 2.2 | (98) | 13.4 |
| VT | Green Mountain | 435.6 | (98) | 0.0 | 225.9 | (97) | 80.3 |
| MI | Hiawatha | 778.2 | (96) | 32.1 | 724.7 | (98) | 85.7 |
| IN | Hoosier | 138.3 | (98) | 24.9 | 7.4 | (96) | 155.7 |
| MI | Huron | 396.2 | (97) | 202.4 | 339.1 | (96) | 259.5 |
| MI | Manistee | 732.0 | (97) | 0.0 | 467.6 | (96) | 148.3 |
| MO | Mark Twain | 1,237.0 | (98) | 1,211.7 | 1,149.3 | (97) | 1,299.4 |
| WV | Monongahela | 1,878.3 | (98) | 0.0 | 1,562.5 | (97) | 183.7 |
| WI | Nicolet | 934.9 | (98) | 0.0 | 703.6 | (97) | 87.0 |
| MI | Ottawa | 1,270.6 | (98) | 0.0 | 799.3 | (96) | 204.1 |
| IL | Shawnee | 27.7 | (96) | 119.2 | 17.4 | (97) | 129.6 |
| MN | Superior | 897.6 | (96) | 0.0 | 695.5 | (97) | 155.2 |
| OH | Wayne | 16.4 | (97) | 163.7 | 11.4 | (96) | 168.7 |
| NH | White Mountain | 585.7 | (98) | 0.0 | 470.0 | (97) | 100.0 |
| | Regional Office | 18,031.3 | | 1,763.2 | 14,831.1 | | 3,589.3 |
| Region 10 | | | | | | | |
| AK | Chugach | 74.5 | (98) | 32.8 | 46.3 | (97) | 61.0 |
| AK | Tongass | 5,840.6 | (96) | 3,149.7 | 1,140.6 | (97) | 7,849.7 |
| | Regional Office | 5,915.1 | | 3,182.4 | 1,186.9 | | 7,910.7 |
| NFS Total | | 275,478.4 | | 145,025.4 | 205,679.9 | | 207,448.4 |